| | Case 2:20-cv-01003-KJM-KJN Document 44 | Filed 08/30/22 | Page 1 of 2 |
|----|--|-----------------|-------------|
| 1 | | | |
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 9 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | Jimmie Stephen, | No. 2:20-cv-100 | 3-KJM-KJN |
| 12 | Petitioner, | ORDER | |
| 13 | V. | | |
| 14 | Warden G. Matteson, | | |
| 15 | Respondent. | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | Petitioner Jimmie Stephen moves this court to reconsider its order adopting the magistrate | | |
| 18 | judge's findings and recommendations and entering judgment in this case. See generally Mot. | | |
| 19 | Recons., ECF No. 43. Stephen moved for reconsideration eleven days after this court entered | | |
| 20 | judgment, so Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) applies. See Fed R. Civ. P. 59(e) ("A motion | | |
| 21 | to alter or amend a judgment must be filed no later than 28 days after the entry of the judgment."). | | |
| 22 | A Rule 59(e) motion "should not be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances, unless the | | |
| 23 | district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if there is an | | |
| 24 | intervening change in the controlling law." 389 Orange Street Partners v. Arnold, 179 F.3d 656, | | |
| 25 | 665 (9th Cir. 1999). | | |
| 26 | Stephen does not present this court with new evidence, argue the court committed clear | | |
| 27 | error, or point to an intervening change in controlling law; Stephen instead argues the court is | | |
| 28 | required to stay his case while he exhausts claims he did not raise in his habeas petition. See Mot. | | |
| | 1 | | |

1 Recons. at 1–2 (citing Rhines v. Weber, 544 U.S. 269 (2005)). Stephen does not explain why he 2 failed to exhaust these claims, and as the court noted in its previous order Stephen "has not cited 3 any clearly established federal law that would provide relief based on the proposed new claims." 4 Order at 2. The court denies Stephen's motion for reconsideration. See Rhines, 544 U.S. at 277 5 ("[E]ven if a petitioner ha[s] good cause for [failing to exhaust], the district court would abuse its 6 discretion if it were to grant him a stay when his unexhausted claims are plainly meritless."). 7 This case is **closed**. 8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

Case 2:20-cv-01003-KJM-KJN Document 44 Filed 08/30/22 Page 2 of 2

DATED: August 30, 2022.

9

10

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE